

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 4 and 12-16 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested since no new issues are raised by entry of this Amendment and it places the Application in condition for allowance or at least in better form for appeal.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 was objected to as containing a minor typographical error. Applicants have amended claim 4 to correct the typographical errors. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection is moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for containing informalities. Applicants have amended the claims to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-13, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mirashrafi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,096) in view of Busey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,708). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a Web collaborative browsing method that includes sending a created control message to an IRC server over a network such that the IRC server that receives the sent event occurrence control message, transfers the received control message to a plurality of clients participating in said collaborative browsing session opened by the collaborative browsing client. As admitted in the Office Action, on page 5, Mirashrafi fails to teach or suggest an IRC server. The Office action relies on Busey as allegedly teaching this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to adapt the Bridgeport in Mirashrafi to implement an IRC protocol disclosed in Busey to provide what appears to be real time communication. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight by merely picking and choosing elements from Busey while

using Applicants claims as a blueprint since there is no motivation in either reference that would achieve the features recited in claim 1 – this is not permissible.

Specifically, Claim 1 recites the IRC protocol is used to send control messages and the Examiner admits that this feature is not disclosed in Mirashrafi. The Examiner relies on Busey disclosure of an IRC chat function and then alleges that it would be obvious to use the IRC protocol in Mirashrafi to send control messages. However, the IRC protocol disclosed in Busey is merely for chat sessions (See, for example, Figures 6 and 7). Busy does not teach or suggest that the IRC protocol should be used to establish a collaborative browsing session by sending control message via the IRC protocol – in fact, Busey actually shows, in Figure 6 for example, that the pages are loaded via HTTP. At best, the combination of Busey and Mirashrafi would result in the system disclosed by Mirashrafi with the addition of an IRC chat as disclosed by Busey.

Accordingly, no combination of Mirashrafi and Busey teach or suggest a Web collaborative browsing method that includes sending a created control message to an IRC server over a network such that the IRC server that receives the sent event occurrence control message, transfers the received control message to a plurality of clients participating in said collaborative browsing session opened by the collaborative browsing client, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 7 and 11 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 because claims 7 and 11 recite features similar to the features of claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 3, 15, and 16 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1, 7, and 11 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1, 7, and 11.* Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

B. Claims 4, 8, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mirashrafi in view of Busey and further in view of Esenther (U.S. Application No. 2002/0138624). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4, 8, 9, and 14 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1, 7, and 11 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1, 7, and 11 and because Esenther does not remedy at least the deficiencies of the combination of Mirashrafi and Busey discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By:


Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: October 3, 2005